

REMARKS

Claims 36-38 are added herein. Claims 1-38 are now pending in the application.

Title of the Invention

The Office Action objected to the title of the invention as allegedly being non-descriptive.

The Title of the Invention has been amended herein to be more descriptive. The Applicants respectfully request the objection to the Title of the Invention be withdrawn.

Objection to the Abstract

The Office Action objected to the Abstract as allegedly exceeding a 150 word limit specified in MPEP 608.01(b).

The Applicants respectfully request the original Abstract on page 26 of the specification be canceled and replaced with the attached substitute Abstract.

The length of the Abstract is corrected herein. The Applicants respectfully request the objection to the Abstract be withdrawn.

35 USC 112 Second Paragraph Rejection of Claims 9, 10, 24 and 25

The Office Action rejected claims 9, 10, 24 and 25 as allegedly being indefinite under 35 USC 112.

The claims have been reviewed and are amended where appropriate. It is respectfully submitted that claims 9, 10, 24 and 25 are now in full conformance with 35 USC 112. It is respectfully requested that the 35 USC 112 rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-4 over Sizer

In the Office Action, claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,021,432 to Sizer, II et al. ("Sizer"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 1-4 recite a data worker module to automatically selectively retrieve data from at least one data source according to a first user defined criteria **and** a data forwarder to automatically selectively forward the data to a destination device according to a **second user defined criteria**.

Sizer appears to disclose a system and method for capturing only those pieces of information of a broadcast stream for future playback that correspond to one or more pre-selected types of information (Abstract). An information processing device 104 is used to capture and playback selected broadcast information (Sizer, Fig. 1; col. 2, lines 35-43).

Sizer discloses a system that passively waits until information is broadcast to it and selectively records information from the broadcast. Sizer's system that passively waits for information to be broadcast to it is **NOT** a system that retrieves data from a data source, much less one that **automatically selectively retrieves data** from a data source, as recited by claims 1, 3 and 4.

Moreover, claims 1-4 recite an individualized network information delivery system interposed between at least one data source and a destination device.

As discussed above, Sizer discloses an information processing device 104 used to capture and playback selected broadcast information (Sizer, Fig. 1; col. 2, lines 35-43). Sizer's destination device is THE device that selectively records information from a broadcast. Sizer fails to disclose an individualized network information delivery system interposed between at least one data source and a destination device, as recited by claims 1-4.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 1-4 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 3 and 4 over Schultz

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,453,339 to Shultz et al. ("Shultz"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 1, 3 and 4 recite a data worker module to selectively retrieve data from at least one data source according to a first user defined criteria **and** a data forwarder to **selectively forward** the data to a destination device according to a **second user defined criteria**.

Shultz appears to disclose a system and method for presenting data from a plurality of sources to a user (Abstract). A user subscribes to personal, workgroup or public channels to receive broadcasted information on a specific subject (Shultz, col. 3, lines 21-23). Once a subscribed to a channel, user can "tune in" to browse headlines and to determine whether to open an attached report object for more detail (Shultz, col. 3, lines 23-26). An automated process termed a messenger alerts the user when an event pertinent to that user has occurred, with a link to a referenced content page (Shultz, col. 48-52).

Shultz discloses automatically retrieving data from a plurality of sources based on user defined criteria. However, the user is either required to "tune in" to review the data or is sent an alert, not the data itself, that data pertinent to the user is awaiting review. Shultz fails to disclose or suggest automatically selectively forwarding data to a destination device according to a second user defined criteria, as recited by claims 1, 3 and 4.

A benefit of a data worker module to automatically selectively retrieve data from at least one data source according to a first user defined criteria **and** a data forwarder to **automatically selectively forward** the data to a destination device according to a second user defined criteria is, e.g., reduced annoyance to a user with easy access to desired data. A user can set a data worker module to automatically selectively retrieve data from at least one data source according to a first user defined criteria, such as, e.g., weather information for a particular city. A user can also set a data forwarder to automatically selectively forward the data to a destination device according to a

second user defined criteria, such as, e.g., only when there is a notice that the weather forecast predicts rain. However, since the data worker has already retrieved the weather information, a user that desires to see additional weather information can conveniently access weather for a particular city without having to search additional data sources. Claimed features with such benefits are not disclosed or suggested by the cited prior art.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 1, 3 and 4 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 5, 10 and 14 over Schultz in view of IBM

In the Office Action, claims 5, 10 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Shultz in view of A Process for Customized Information Delivery, IBM ("IBM"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 5, 10 and 14 are dependent on claim 1, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 5, 10 and 14 recite a data worker module to automatically selectively retrieve data from at least one data source according to a first user defined criteria and a data forwarder to automatically selectively forward the data to a destination device according to a second user defined criteria.

As discussed above, Shultz fails to disclose or suggest automatically selectively forwarding data to a destination device according to a second user defined criteria, as recited by claims 5, 10 and 14.

IBM is relied on to disclose a home PC gathering material from the web and translating the material into an audio format for replay in a car (Office Action, page 7). IBM discloses selective retrieval of content from a data source according to a first user defined criteria, i.e., what the user desired from the web. However, IBM, like Shultz, fails to disclose or suggest a data forwarder to automatically selectively forward the data to a destination device according to a second user defined criteria, as recited by claims 5, 10 and 14.

Thus, Shultz modified by the disclosure of IBM would still fail to disclose, teach or suggest a data worker module to automatically selectively retrieve data from at least one data source according to a first user defined criteria and a data forwarder to automatically selectively forward the data to a destination device according to a second user defined criteria, as recited by claims 5, 10 and 14.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 5, 10 and 14 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 6-9, 15, 19 and 21 over Schultz in view of Herz

In the Office Action, claims 6-9, 15, 19 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Shultz in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,029,195 to Herz ("Herz"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 6-9, 15, 19 and 21 are dependent on claim 1, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 6-9, 15, 19 and 21 recite a data worker module to automatically selectively retrieve data from at least one data source according to a first user defined criteria and a data forwarder to automatically selectively forward the data to a destination device according to a second user defined criteria.

As discussed above, Shultz fails to disclose or suggest selectively forwarding data to a destination device according to a second user defined criteria, as recited by claims 6-9, 15, 19 and 21.

Herz is relied on to disclose a query engine adapted to query a database for content (Office Action, page 8). Depending on a user's interest levels for various topics, the system generates a user-customized rank ordered listing of target objects most likely to be of interest to each user (Herz, col. 35, lines 56-64). Users' target profile interest summaries can be used to efficiently

organize the distribution of information in a large scale system and network (Herz, col. 34, lines 33-45).

Thus, Herz discloses a system for and method of allowing a user to define criteria that is used to selectively retrieve content from a data source. However, Herz fails to disclose or suggest a data forwarder to automatically selectively forward the data to a destination device according to a **second user defined criteria**, as recited by claims 6-9, 15, 19 and 21.

Thus, Shultz modified by the disclosure of Herz would still fail to disclose, teach or suggest a data worker module to automatically selectively retrieve data from at least one data source according to a first user defined criteria **and** a data forwarder to automatically selectively forward the data to a destination device according to a **second user defined criteria**, as recited by claims 6-9, 15, 19 and 21.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 6-9, 15, 19 and 21 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 11, 12 and 16 over Schultz in view of XML

In the Office Action, claims 11, 12 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Shultz in view of the definition of XML in The American Heritage Dictionary, Fourth Edition ("XML"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 11, 12 and 16 are dependent on claim 1, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 11, 12 and 16 recite a data worker module to automatically selectively retrieve data from at least one data source according to a first user defined criteria **and** a data forwarder to automatically selectively forward the data to a destination device according to a **second user defined criteria**.

As discussed above, Shultz fails to disclose or suggest automatically selectively forwarding data to a destination device according to a **second user defined criteria**, as recited by claims 11, 12 and 16.

The Examiner relies on XML as a metalanguage written in SGML that allows one to design a markup language that facilitates the exchange of data (Office Action, page 11). Thus, nothing within the definition of and/or the use of XML discloses or suggests a data forwarder to automatically selectively forward the data to a destination device according to a **second user defined criteria**, as recited by claims 11, 12 and 16.

Thus, Shultz modified by the definition of XML would still fail to disclose, teach or suggest a data worker module to automatically selectively retrieve data from at least one data source according to a first user defined criteria **and** a data forwarder to automatically selectively forward the data to a destination device according to a **second user defined criteria**, as recited by claims 11, 12 and 16.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 11, 12 and 16 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 13 over Sizer in view of XML and McConnell

In the Office Action, claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Sizer in view of the definition of XML, and further in view of *An Experimental 4-Mb Flash EEPROM with Sector Erase* to McConnell ("McConnell"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 13 is dependent on claim 1, and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 13 recites a data worker module to automatically selectively retrieve data from at least one data source according to a first user defined criteria **and** a data forwarder to automatically selectively forward the data to a destination device according to a **second user defined criteria**.

As discussed above, Sizer fails to disclose or **suggest** automatically selectively forwarding data to a destination device according to a **second user defined criteria**, as recited by claim 13.

McConnell is relies on to disclose memory that may be programmed 1 byte at a time and an experimental EEPROM flashing process on 4-Mbs density flash memories (Office Action, page 12). Thus, McConnell fails to disclose or suggest any details related to the retrieval and forwarding of information from a data source, much less a data forwarder to automatically selectively forward the data to a destination device according to a second user defined criteria, as recited by claim 13.

Thus, Shultz modified by the definition of XML and McConnell would still fail to disclose, teach or suggest a data worker module to automatically selectively retrieve data from at least one data source according to a first user defined criteria and a data forwarder to automatically selectively forward the data to a destination device according to a second user defined criteria, as recited by claim 13.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claim 13 is patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 17 over Schultz in view of Herz and Kantor

In the Office Action, claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Shultz in view of Herz, and further in view of Request for Comments:977, Network Working Group to Kantor ("Kantor"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 17 is dependent on claim 1, and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 17 recites a data worker module to automatically selectively retrieve data from at least one data source according to a first user defined criteria and a data forwarder to automatically selectively forward the data to a destination device according to a second user defined criteria.

As discussed above, Shultz modified by the disclosure of Herz fails to disclose or suggest automatically selectively forwarding data to a destination device according to a second user defined criteria, as recited by claim 17.

Kantor is relied on to disclose a Network News Transfer Protocol ("NNTP") to communicate with a news server to transfer articles between servers (Office Action, page 14). Thus, Schultz modified by the disclosure of Herz and Kantor would as best, even if they were obvious to combine which they are not, use NNTP for the selectively retrieve data from at least one data source according to a user defined criteria, **NOT** disclosing or suggesting a data forwarder to automatically selectively forward the data to a destination device according to a **second user defined criteria**, as recited by claim 17.

Thus, Shultz modified by the disclosure of Herz and Kantor would still fail to disclose, teach or **suggest** a data worker module to automatically selectively retrieve data from at least one data source according to a first user defined criteria **and** a data forwarder to automatically selectively forward the data to a destination device according to a **second user defined criteria**, as recited by claim 17.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claim 17 is patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 18 over Schultz in view of Small

In the Office Action, claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Shultz in view of Request for Comments:2739, Network Working Group to Small ("Small"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 18 is dependent on claim 1, and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 18 recites a data worker module to automatically selectively retrieve data from at least one data source according to a first user defined criteria **and** a data forwarder to automatically selectively forward the data to a destination device according to a **second user defined criteria**.

As discussed above, Shultz modified by the disclosure of Herz fails to disclose or **suggest automatically selectively forwarding** data to a destination device according to a **second user defined criteria**, as recited by claim 18.

Small is relied on to disclose additional data sources (Office Action, page 14). Thus, Schultz modified by the disclosure of Small, even with the ability to search additional data sources, fails to disclose or suggest a data forwarder to **selectively forward** the data to a destination device according to a **second user defined criteria**, as recited by claim 18.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claim 18 is patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 20 over Schultz in view of Macera

In the Office Action, claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Shultz in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,453,339 to Macera et al. ("Macera"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 20 is dependent on claim 1, and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 20 recites a data worker module to **automatically** selectively retrieve data from at least one data source according to a first user defined criteria **and** a data forwarder to **automatically selectively forward** the data to a destination device according to a **second user defined criteria**.

As discussed above, Shultz modified by the disclosure of Herz fails to disclose or **suggest automatically selectively forwarding** data to a destination device according to a **second user defined criteria**, as recited by claim 20.

Macera is relied on to disclose a system and method to augment the searchable data sources (Office Action, page 15). Macera discloses a system and method of converting and routing data packets within a data network (Abstract), not disclosing or suggesting **selective retrieval** and **selective forwarding** of data. However, even if it were obvious to modify Shultz with the disclosure of Macera to augment the searchable data sources (which it is not),

Shultz modified by Macera would still fail to disclose or suggest automatically selectively forwarding data to a destination device according to a **second user defined criteria**, as recited by claim 20.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claim 20 is patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 22 over Schultz in view of Reed

In the Office Action, claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Shultz in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,088,717 to Reed et al. ("Reed"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 22 recites a data worker module to automatically selectively retrieve data from at least one data source according to a first user defined criteria **and** a data forwarder to automatically selectively forward the data to a destination device according to a **second user defined criteria**.

As discussed above, Shultz fails to disclose or **suggest** automatically selectively forwarding data to a destination device according to a **second user defined criteria**, as recited by claim 22.

Reed is relied on to disclose a communication system that allows a user to receive an e-mail notification from a database agent monitoring the database when a new entry or a certain condition has been made in that database at col. 6, lines 62-66 (Office Action, page 15). Reed is further relied on to disclose that a data exchange event is initiated either manually by the consumer or automatically at col. 76, lines 8-9 (Office Action, page 15).

Reed discloses information contained in a provider database that is transferred and used in communications relationships with different consumers (col. 9, lines 2-4). The association information is used to selectively distribute information and information updates (Reed, col. 9, lines 6-8).

Thus, Reed discloses selective distribution of information, however, the criteria used to control the selective distribution of information is based on association information. Thus, Reed discloses selective distribution of

information based on association information, **NOT** disclosing or suggesting a data forwarder to automatically selectively forward data to a destination device according to a **second user defined criteria**, much less a data worker module to automatically selectively retrieve data from at least one data source according to a first user defined criteria **and** a data forwarder to automatically selectively forward the data to a destination device according to a **second user defined criteria**, as recited by claim 22.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claim 22 is patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 23-25 over Schultz in view of Reed and von-Bultzingloewen

In the Office Action, claims 23-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Shultz in view of Reed, and further in view of *Active Information Delivery in A COBRA-Based Distributed Information System* to von-Bultzingloewen ("von-Bultzingloewen"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 23-25 are dependent on claim 22, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 22.

Claims 23-25 recite a data worker module to automatically selectively retrieve data from at least one data source according to a first user defined criteria **and** a data forwarder to automatically selectively forward the data to a destination device according to a **second user defined criteria**.

As discussed above, Shultz in view of Reed fails to disclose or **suggest** automatically selectively forwarding data to a destination device according to a **second user defined criteria**, as recited by claims 23-25.

The Office Action relies on von-Bultzingloewen to allegedly make up for the deficiencies in Schultz in view of Reed. In particular, von-Bultzingloewen is relied on to disclose a process to monitor database value changes upon the detection of a change in three CLIPS rules, detecting a change in content, changed value and comparison of a new value to a limit value

to determine if an action should proceed (Office Action, page 16). Von-Bultzingloewen relies on a single set of criteria for reviewing information for relevancy from a data source that is passed to user (page 218, second column, lines 5-28). Thus, von-Bultzingloewen fails to disclose automatically selectively forwarding data to a destination device according to a **second user defined criteria**, as recited by claims 23-25.

Schultz modified by Reed and von-Bultzingloewen would still fail to disclose or suggest a data worker module to automatically selectively retrieve data from at least one data source according to a first user defined criteria **and** a data forwarder to automatically selectively forward the data to a destination device according to a **second user defined criteria**, as recited by claims 23-25.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 23-25 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 26, 30, 31 and 35 over Zirngibl in view of Shultz

In the Office Action, claim 26, 30, 31 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,606,596 to Zirngibl et al. ("Zirngibl") in view of Shultz. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 26, 30, 31 and 35 recite a system and method utilizing a data worker to selectively retrieve data from a particular data source according to a first user defined criteria **and selectively** directing content obtained from the data source to a requesting destination device according to a **second user defined criteria**.

Zirngibl discloses a system and method of creating sound files for a destination device based on user criteria, e.g., a report of the result of a favorite sports team game (Fig. 3a; col. 5, lines 55-65). Thus, Zirngibl's user only specifies a set of criteria for locating and downloading a desired piece of information. Zirngibl fails to disclose or suggest use of two criteria, a first criteria for automatically selectively retrieving data from a data source **and** a **second**

criteria for automatically selectively directing content obtained from the data source to a requesting destination device, as recited by claims 26, 30, 31 and 35.

As discussed above, Shultz discloses automatically retrieving data from a plurality of sources based on user defined criteria. However, the user is either required to “tune in” to review the data or is sent an alert that data pertinent to the user is awaiting review. Shultz fails to disclose or suggest automatically selectively directing content obtained from the data source to a requesting destination device according to a second user defined criteria, as recited by claims 26, 30, 31 and 35.

Thus, Zirngibl modified by the disclosure of Schultz fails to disclose a system and method utilizing a data worker to automatically selectively retrieve data from a particular data source according to a first user defined criteria and automatically selectively directing content obtained from the data source to a requesting destination device according to a second user defined criteria, as recited by claims 26, 30, 31 and 35.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 26, 30, 31 and 35 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 27 and 32 over Zirngibl in view of Daswani

In the Office Action, claim 27 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Zirngibl in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,477,565 to Daswani et al. (“Daswani”). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 27 and 32 are dependent on claims 26 and 31 respectively, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 26 and 31.

Claims 27 and 32 recite a system and method utilizing a data worker to automatically selectively retrieve data from a particular data source according to a first user defined criteria and automatically selectively directing content obtained from the data source to a requesting destination device according to a second user defined criteria.

As discussed above, Zirngibl fails to disclose or suggest use of two criteria, a first criteria for automatically selectively retrieving data from a data source **and** a second criteria for automatically selectively directing content obtained from the data source to a requesting destination device, as recited by claims 27 and 32.

Daswani discloses a system and method for retrieving and disseminating information records from Internet sources that includes a client device and an intermediary server system (Abstract). A request for data can include a data result of a site-specific search according to defined parameters, information about departure/arrival parameters and gate instructions, a desire to access only existing incoming mail from a certain individual or individuals (Daswani, col. 7, lines 17-30).

Thus, Daswani discloses a system and method of allowing a user to selectively retrieve data from a data source according to a user defined criteria. However, Daswani fails to disclose or **suggest** a system and method utilizing a data worker to automatically selectively retrieve data from a particular data source according to a first user defined criteria **and** automatically selectively directing content obtained from the data source to a requesting destination device according to a **second user defined criteria**, as recited by claims 27 and 32.

Thus, even if it were obvious to modify Zirngibl with the disclosure of Daswani (which it is not), the result would still fail to disclose or **suggest** a system and method utilizing a data worker to automatically selectively retrieve data from a particular data source according to a first user defined criteria **and** automatically selectively directing content obtained from the data source to a requesting destination device according to a **second user defined criteria**, as recited by claims 27 and 32.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 27 and 32 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 28, 29 and 33-35 over Zirngibl in view of von-Bultzingloewen and Reed

In the Office Action, claims 28, 29, 33 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Zirngibl in view of von-Bultzingloewen, with claim 35 rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Zirngibl in view of von-Bultzingloewen and Reed. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 28, 29, 33 and 34 are dependent on claims 26 and 31 respectively, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 26 and 31.

Claims 28, 29 and 33-35 recite a system and method utilizing a data worker to automatically selectively retrieve data from a particular data source according to a first user defined criteria **and automatically selectively** directing content obtained from the data source to a requesting destination device according to a **second user defined criteria**.

As discussed above, Zirngibl fails to disclose or suggest a system and method utilizing a data worker to automatically selectively retrieve data from a particular data source according to a first user defined criteria **and automatically selectively** directing content obtained from the data source to a requesting destination device according to a **second user defined criteria**, as recited by claims 28, 29 and 33-35.

As discussed above, von-Bultzingloewen relies on a single set of criteria for reviewing information for relevancy from a data source that is passed to user (page 218, second column, lines 5-28). Von-Bultzingloewen fails to disclose or **suggest** a system and method utilizing a data worker to automatically selectively retrieve data from a particular data source according to a first user defined criteria **and automatically selectively** directing content obtained from the data source to a requesting destination device according to a **second user defined criteria**, as recited by claims 28, 29 and 33-35.

As discussed above, Reed discloses selective distribution of information based on a single criteria **NOT** automatically selectively directing

content obtained from the data source to a requesting destination device according to a **second user defined criteria**, as recited by claims 28, 29 and 33-35.


Thus, Zirngibl modified by the disclosure of von-Bultzingloewen and Reed would still fail to disclose or suggest a system and method utilizing a data worker to automatically selectively retrieve data from a particular data source according to a first user defined criteria **and automatically selectively** directing content obtained from the data source to a requesting destination device according to a **second user defined criteria**, as recited by claims 28, 29 and 33-35.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 28, 29 and 33-35 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



William H. Bollman
Reg. No.: 36,457
Tel. (202) 261-1020
Fax. (202) 887-0336

MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC

2000 M Street, NW 7TH Floor
Washington, DC 20036-3307
TEL. (202) 261-1020
FAX. (202) 887-0336

WHB/df